•	9	_
		•
_		_

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/069,273	ARIFUKU ET AL.	
Notice of Allowability	Examiner	Art Unit	
·			
	Margaret G. Moore	1712	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RI of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313	(OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this apport or other appropriate communication GHTS. This application is subject to	plication. If not included will be mailed in due c	d ourse. THIS
1. This communication is responsive to the amendment filed 2	<u>2/18/05</u> .		
2. The allowed claim(s) is/are 1 to 5, 18, 25 to 29, 31 and 32.			
3. \square The drawings filed on <u>03 May 2002</u> are accepted by the Ex	aminer.		
4.	been received. been received in Application Nocuments have been received in this of this communication to file a reply ENT of this application. itted. Note the attached EXAMINER's reason(s) why the oath or declarate to be submitted. on's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-6) and Amendment / Comment or in the Comment of the drawing he header according to 37 CFR 1.121(content of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL metallicity).	national stage application of the total of the submitted. Note that the submitted.	uirements OTICE OF
Attachment(s) 1. ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2. ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3. ☐ Information Disclosure Statements (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/06 Paper No./Mail Date 4. ☐ Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit of Biological Material	5. Notice of Informal P 6. Interview Summary Paper No./Mail Dat 7. Examiner's Amendn 8. Examiner's Stateme 9. Other	(PTO-413), de nent/Comment	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-37 (Rev. 1-04) Art Unit: 1712

1. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: In view of applicants' claims as amended 2/18/05, the instant claims distinguish themselves from the prior art. Taki et al. was applied against the claims in the previous office action. Presently, however, there is no motivation to select from the various components taught in Taki et al. ones necessary to arrive at an adhesive having a modulus of elasticity as claimed. This is true particularly because Taki et al. fail to mention the modulus of elasticity for the silicone particles. The claims also distinguish themselves from Taki et al. in that patentees fail to specifically teach the addition of an electrically conductive particle, as well as a curing agent capable of generating a free radical upon heating. In view of the totality of requirements in instant claim 1, the instant invention is neither taught nor adequately suggested by the prior art.

Independent claim 32 is allowed over Taki et al. because the prior art fails to teach or suggest the flowability requirements claimed. One cannot assume that the flowability requirement in claim 32 or the modulus of elasticity requirement of claim 1 are inherently present in the composition of Taki et al. since patentees fail to anticipate each of the necessary components. Independent claim 31 is allowed over Taki et al. because patentees fail to teach or suggest a composition containing the chemical formula (1).

The Examiner cites other references as being of general interest that fail to teach or suggest the claimed composition. Again, none teaches a composition containing the chemical formula found in claim 31. For claims 1 and 32, the prior art fails to teach or adequately suggest a composition having each of the claimed components and meeting the claimed physical requirements. Nakano et al, Kleyer et al. and Segawa et al. teach the addition of silicone particles but fail to anticipate the addition of particles meeting the claimed requirements. Each reference is silent as to the flowability and modulus of elasticity properties.

The Examiner also acknowledges that the claimed adhesive must be "adapted to be used to electrically connect wiring terminals...", something that is not suggested by the silicone rubbers of Nakano et al. and Kleyer et al. Additionally Segawa et al. fail to

Art Unit: 1712

adequately suggest the curing agent in combination with a radically polymerizable substance.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Margaret G. Moore whose telephone number is 571-272-1090. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Wednesday and Friday, 10am to 4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski can be reached on (571) 272-1302. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1712

mgm 3/3/05